

**Fiscal Impacts of the
University of California at Berkeley Long Range
Development Plan upon the City of Berkeley**

Prepared for:

City of Berkeley

Prepared by:

ECONOMIC AND PLANNING SYSTEMS, INC.
Berkeley, California


**INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY**

June 1989

JUL - 6 1989

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

717



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C124899080>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	3
III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION - LONG RANG DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND ALTERNATIVES	6
IV. SETTING	9
V. COST/REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS	10
VI. POTENTIAL FISCAL IMPACTS	14
VII. MITIGATION MEASURES	17

APPENDIX A: LRDP Project List

APPENDIX B: Fiscal Model Budget Summaries

I. INTRODUCTION

The University of California at Berkeley has prepared a Draft Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) to guide development of U.C. Berkeley until the year 2005. Including some facilities which the Regents of the University have already approved, the proposed Plan would include the addition of buildings totalling 2.8 million gross square feet (GSF) for increased academic, support and residential space. The proposed residence halls and apartments include capacity for 4,702 additional student residents.

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), U.C. Berkeley has prepared an accompanying Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) to assess the potential environmental impacts of the proposed plan. Since the development proposed in the Draft LRDP would represent a significant expansion of U.C. Berkeley, the City of Berkeley has conducted a comprehensive review of and response to the Draft LRDP/DEIR to ensure that the impacts of the Draft Plan are adequately addressed and considered by U.C. Berkeley in the formulation of the Final LRDP.

The DEIR does not contain a fiscal impact analysis, although the Draft LRDP could result in significant impacts on public services provided by the City. Although CEQA does not specifically require the inclusion of fiscal impact studies in EIRs, the fiscal impacts of the Draft LRDP could result in significant environmental effects in terms of public health and safety, and water quality.

In order to better understand the potential impacts that the Draft LRDP could have on the City's public services and fiscal balance, the City has commissioned this independent analysis of the potential fiscal impacts of the Draft LRDP as part of its response to the DEIR. The DEIR does contain an analysis of demands for public services and utilities, but the City felt that a more quantitative analysis such as that presented in this report was required.

There has been a long-standing discussion between the City and U.C. Berkeley regarding the service demands placed upon the City by U.C. Berkeley and the lack of adequate compensation for these services. The Draft LRDP has the potential to exacerbate the existing fiscal problem, or alternatively, serve as the basis for resolving the problem.

The general cause of the fiscal problem is that U.C. Berkeley is exempt from property taxes, other local taxes, fees, and exactions that the City requires as part of the development review process. At the same time, U.C. Berkeley relies directly on a number of City services, including fire and police protection and sewage transmission; and indirectly on a broader range of City services related to the student and resident population generated by U.C. Berkeley. Examples of indirect services include road reconstruction and maintenance, public health, and parks and recreation programs.

U.C. Berkeley does generate a great deal of secondary economic activity (e.g. retail sales by students, staff and faculty) that is in turn taxed by the City. It is the City's view that these benefits from secondary economic activity are inadequate, especially given the magnitude of the direct costs required to serve U.C. Berkeley, indirect costs associated with off-Campus induced activity, and the deteriorated condition of infrastructure within the City, particularly roads and sewers. In addition, Measure N, which was approved by Berkeley voters in November 1988, requires the City to "ensure that public agencies ... pay taxes and fees, comparable to those paid by private citizens and businesses, to support their fair share of city services."

The fiscal analysis presented in this report was conducted utilizing standard methodology that is applied to development proposals in EIRs to be used as a basis for determining impact and necessary mitigations. The analysis consisted of the following components:

- An analysis of the development proposed in the Draft LRDP and relevant Alternatives.
- Preparation of a budget model for the City of Berkeley.
- Forecasting increased costs of providing direct and indirect City services to the U.C. Berkeley campus and the associated students, faculty and staff, due to implementation of the either the Draft LRDP or one of the Alternatives.
- Forecasting increased revenues to the City due to the development proposed in the Draft LRDP and Alternatives.
- Estimates of potential fiscal impacts that may occur.
- Identification of mitigation measures to alleviate the potential fiscal impacts.

A major objective of this fiscal analysis is to provide information missing from the DEIR regarding the effect of the Draft LRDP upon the City's budget. By its very nature, such a study is limited in scope since it is limited to reasonably quantifiable costs and revenues. Many factors which are not considered in this report may ultimately result in adverse impacts on the City's budget in addition to those identified by this fiscal analysis. These potential impacts, such as the need to provide additional low and moderate housing or additional child care facilities in the City due to increased U.C. Berkeley undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral students, faculty, and other staff, are discussed in the City staff's evaluation of the Draft LRDP and DEIR.

Another important objective of this report is to present mitigation measures which reduce the significance of the potential fiscal impacts. The implementation of such mitigation is important for two main reasons. First, potential fiscal impacts of the Draft LRDP must be alleviated in order to assure a healthy community for all who live, work and visit the City, including those associated with U.C. Berkeley. Additionally, successful mitigation of the Draft LRDP's fiscal impacts will enable the City and U.C. Berkeley to begin to resolve long-standing conflicts that are ultimately counter-productive to both institutions.

II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The City of Berkeley presently provides a variety of services to U.C. Berkeley without adequate direct compensation.

The potential impacts of the Draft LRDP must be viewed within the context of the existing relationship between U.C. Berkeley and the City. At the present time, the City provides a variety of services, such as police protection, fire protection and sewage transmission, that directly benefit U.C. Berkeley as an institution and the population living in University-operated housing in Berkeley. Costs associated with direct services provided to U.C. Berkeley by the City are estimated to equal \$2.7 million annually, including more than \$2 million for police and fire protection.

In recent years, U.C. Berkeley has provided limited funding for these services and provided enhancements to other City services and programs. For example, a service charge for sewer transmission of approximately \$100,000 is being paid; however, this is less than one-third of the City's actual cost. U.C. Berkeley has also assisted with law enforcement activities, planning, youth programs and homeless aid, and last year paid \$320,000 to the City for a fire truck with an estimated cost of \$347,000.

The fiscal impacts of the Draft LRDP depend upon the amount of new U.C. Berkeley floor space, how the space is utilized, and the nature of any additional land in off-Campus sites which may be removed from the City's tax rolls.

Additional costs and revenues to the City will be induced by increased floor space and/or population due to implementation of the Draft LRDP, including daytime population (non-resident students and employees) and resident population. New resident population causes the greatest impact upon costs and revenues. Conversion of sites such as the "Opportunity Sites" discussed in the Draft LRDP which currently produce property taxes, sales taxes and other direct revenues, into U.C. Berkeley facilities would cause an additional fiscal impact.

Major new costs could be incurred by the City if existing service levels are maintained.

Costs for police protection, fire protection, emergency medical services and sewage transmission will all increase as a result of the Draft LRDP if current service levels are maintained. Increased costs for police and fire protection would exceed \$1 million dollars for the Draft LRDP as proposed when it is fully built-out. Total service costs analyzed would equal approximately \$1.4 million annually.

In addition, potential impacts induced by such factors as increased demand for child care or low-income housing due to the Draft LRDP may also cause increased costs to the City. These potential effects are discussed in the City Staff comments on the Draft LRDP and DEIR.

There is no indication in the Draft LRDP or DEIR that U.C. Berkeley will pay the City to fund these increased costs.

The only direct revenues currently being paid by U.C. Berkeley to the City is an annual sewer service charge of approximately \$100,000. The amount of this payment is scheduled to increase with inflation, regardless of the level of U.C. Berkeley's development and use of the sanitary sewer system. In addition, U.C. Berkeley has proposed a service charge for housing developments constructed on property not currently owned by U.C. Berkeley, but the adequacy of this fee is limited since it is based on construction value of the development rather than on actual service costs, and it does not apply to all proposed facilities.

Estimated indirect revenues will offset but not fully cover the increased costs.

Indirect revenues caused by implementation of the Draft LRDP would not equal direct and indirect cost estimates. The largest source of indirect revenue is subvention revenues from the State of California which are distributed according to population. In addition, sales tax revenues would also be generated by new residents and non-resident students and staff. Total revenues will increase proportionally with new City residents and non-resident students and staff; however, service costs are shown to exceed these revenues.

The Draft LRDP would produce a negative fiscal impact on the City. The most likely result of the fiscal impact will be reduced service levels for Berkeley residents.

The annual fiscal deficit (service costs minus revenues) shown at completion of the Draft LRDP as proposed equals more than \$1 million. Although a deficit is shown by the fiscal model, these costs would not actually be incurred since there would be inadequate revenue in the City's budget, and the City is not permitted to operate under a deficit. The estimates simply reflect what costs would be if existing service levels are continued. Instead, service levels will decline as the increased demand associated with the Draft LRDP materialize. For example, the City may decide to provide a lower standard of police protection to avoid a deficit, or the City may further defer maintenance on its sewers and other facilities.

A variety of measures could be adopted by U.C. Berkeley that would reduce or eliminate significant potential fiscal impacts.

The existing range of mitigation measures that have been used in the past by U.C. Berkeley or are proposed in the Draft LRDP and DEIR and elsewhere provide a basis for a more definitive and equitable mitigation program than is currently set forth in the DEIR. The following mitigation measures are recommended:

Payment for Service. The service fee proposed by U.C. Berkeley for off-campus housing should be modified to reflect the actual costs of providing required services, rather than basing the fee on property value. Such service charges, which can pay for fire protection, police protection and other costs, can be developed as a contract between the City and U.C. Berkeley and annually adjusted to take into consideration changes in facility utilization or changes in City costs.

Sewer Charges. U.C. Berkeley should increase the service charge it currently pays to the City for sewage service to reflect actual costs of providing the service. U.C. Berkeley should share in the cost of meeting maintenance and reconstruction costs.

Capital Improvements. U.C. Berkeley may mitigate many of the potential impacts of the Draft LRDP by providing the City with needed facilities and improvements, as U.C Berkeley has already done by assisting the City in the purchase of a fire truck. For example, City Staff have requested that U.C. Berkeley purchase and equip a Hazardous Materials Response Vehicle for use by the City. Other improvements which may mitigate potential impacts include road reconstruction and intersection improvements.

Development Cooperation. The Draft LRDP includes proposals to develop off-campus sites (Opportunity Sites) in the south of Shattuck area. In order to mitigate potential fiscal impacts, U.C. Berkeley should work with the City in selecting the sites and in planning the facilities.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION -- LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND ALTERNATIVES

The Draft LRDP proposes up to 57 projects located within the campus and in off-campus areas, including facilities for student housing, teaching and research space, administrative offices, and parking. The projects are separated into two categories. Category 1 projects represent those which have received approval from the U.C. Board of Regents but have not yet been constructed. Category 2 projects are those proposed directly in the Draft LRDP. Many of the analyses presented in the DEIR only include the Category 2 projects. For the purposes of this analysis, however, it was necessary to include both Categories of projects. In this manner, a consistent baseline consisting of facilities and impacts which currently exist was established.

The approved and proposed facilities, which would add a total of 2.8 million gross square feet (GSF) and space for 4,702 additional beds, are expected to be fully constructed by the year 2005 according to the analyses performed in the DEIR. This represents a 28% increase over the 9.8 million existing GSF in U.C. Berkeley facilities in the City, and a 94% increase over the existing 5,014 beds in facilities directly operated by U.C. Berkeley. **Appendix A** includes a listing of all approved and proposed projects.

According to the scenario presented in the Draft LRDP this new space will not result in a net increase in the total number of students, faculty, and other staff; rather, the space will alleviate existing crowding in classrooms, improve and expand research space, and provide housing opportunities for students who would otherwise live in private housing. According to the DEIR, the estimated number of graduate and undergraduate students will decline from 31,364 to 30,200, while the number of post-doctoral students, faculty, academic and other staff, and visitors and vendors will increase from 13,529 to 14,711.

Since U.C. Berkeley may choose, or otherwise be obligated to use its new space to accommodate additional students, it is necessary to look at a range of use patterns and densities.

Table 1 presents a summary of the Proposed Project and three Alternatives. The Project and Alternatives reflect different amounts of housing and levels of space utilization. This table shows total floor space for existing development, approved development, and proposed development for each alternative. **Table 1** also shows the University's campus population, including students, faculty and staff, and visitors and vendors, resulting from the existing and future floor space totals.

The Proposed LRDP and the Alternatives presented in **Table 1** are described below:

Table1
Summary Project Description
University of California at Berkeley
Long Range Development Plan

		<u>Draft LRDP Alternatives</u>		<u>Housing</u>	<u>Full</u>
		<u>As Proposed</u>	<u>No Housing</u>	<u>Only</u>	<u>Occupancy</u>
Existing Situation	Buildings -- Gross Square Footage				
	Non-Residential GSF	8,318,421			
	Residential GSF	1,494,761			
	Total	9,813,182			
	Campus Population				
	Students	31,364			
	Faculty/Academic/etc.	5,530			
	Staff	6,809			
	Visitors/Vendors	1,200			
	Total	44,903			
	Student Residents in UC Facilities	5,014			
LRDP Additions and Approved Projects	New Buildings -- Gross Square Footage				
	Non-Residential GSF	1,434,200	1,434,200	533,900	1,434,200
	Residential GSF	1,266,378	312,628	1,266,378	1,266,378
	Retail GSF	79,700	17,700	79,700	79,700
	Total Increment	2,780,278	1,764,528	1,879,978	2,780,278
	Additional Campus Population				
	Students	(1,164)	(1,164)	0	5,408
	Faculty/Academic/etc.	740	740	0	953
	Staff	432	432	0	1,174
	Visitors/Vendors	0	0	0	207
	Total Increment	8	8	0	7,742
	New Student Residents in UC Facilities	4,702	917	4,702	4,702
Bulldout	Buildings -- Gross Square Footage				
	Non-Residential GSF	9,752,621	9,752,621	8,852,321	9,752,621
	Residential GSF	2,761,139	1,807,389	2,761,139	2,761,139
	Retail GSF	79,700	17,700	79,700	79,700
	Total	12,593,460	11,577,710	11,693,160	12,593,460
	Campus Population				
	Students	30,200	30,200	31,364	36,772
	Faculty/Academic/etc.	6,270	6,270	5,530	6,483
	Staff	7,241	7,241	6,809	7,983
	Visitors/Vendors	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,407
	Total	44,911	44,911	44,903	52,645
	Student Residents in UC Facilities	9,716	5,931	9,716	9,716

Sources: University of California at Berkeley, "Draft Long Range Development Plan," Table 7, et al.; UC Berkeley, "Draft EIR -- LRDP," Table 4-14.6, et al.; UC Berkeley, "Building List by C.A.A.N. -- Fall 88;" Economic and Planning Systems, Inc.

LRDP AS PROPOSED -- THE PROJECT

This Alternative is the Proposed LRDP as analyzed in the DEIR. The Plan assumes that U.C. Berkeley will be able to maintain a constant campus population despite the additional square footage.

As discussed above, this Alternative includes 2.8 million GSF, and 4,702 beds.

LRDP NO HOUSING ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is the No Housing Alternative as analyzed in the DEIR and also assumes that U.C. Berkeley will be able to maintain a constant campus population. Although it is termed the "No Housing Alternative" because it includes no new housing proposals, this Alternative actually does include a limited amount of additional housing due to already approved projects in Category 1.

This Alternative includes 1.8 million GSF, and 917 beds.

HOUSING ONLY ALTERNATIVE

This Alternative is not analyzed in the DEIR. It includes only proposed housing projects and all approved projects. We have assumed that campus population will not change from its current size under this Alternative.

This Alternative includes 1.9 million GSF and 4,702 beds.

FULL OCCUPANCY ALTERNATIVE

This Alternative is also not analyzed in the DEIR. In terms of net additions to floor space, this option is comparable to the Draft LRDP Housing Alternative, but assumes that U.C. Berkeley will utilize the additional non-residential building space to add new students, faculty and staff based on the current patterns of utilization of existing buildings.

This Alternative includes 2.8 million GSF, 4,702 beds, and a net addition of 9,716 people to the campus population.

IV. SETTING

The setting of a fiscal analysis is the fiscal condition of the jurisdiction(s) providing services to an area or a proposed project. This fiscal analysis focuses upon the City of Berkeley operating budget and the urban infrastructure maintained by the City.

The Proposed City Budget (1989-90) includes a total of \$141 million in expenditures, and current and accumulated revenues of an equal amount. The Budget is organized into a General Fund and 34 special funds. Property tax is the single largest revenue source, at \$16 million (12 percent of total revenue). Police and Fire Departments are the largest costs with a combined cost of nearly \$26 million. This represents 30 percent of General Fund costs and 18 percent of total costs.

The City of Berkeley faces many of the same fiscal constraints faced by cities and counties throughout California: demands for services and associated costs are increasing faster than revenues. Demands for operating revenues have led to deferred maintenance of roads and other urban infrastructure. Proposition 13, passed by the State's voters in 1978, severely restricted local property taxes, reduced revenues available to local governments and constrained revenue generating options. Additional service demands due to implementation of the Draft LRDP, without compensating revenues, would exacerbate this situation.

Berkeley, which has maintained a high level of activism and concern for social welfare for many years, had prior to Proposition 13 established a broader range of services than typically provided by cities, and accordingly had much higher municipal costs. The City has responded to the revenue limits imposed by Proposition 13 by creating efficiencies where possible, cutting services and developing the few revenue sources still permitted under Proposition 13. New revenues have been obtained by voting in new special taxes (Library Tax), imposing benefit assessments (Landscape and Streetlight Assessment Districts), and increasing user fees and charges (sewer fees).

Although the City has aggressively pursued new revenue sources, it still faces service cut-backs and a continuation of deferred maintenance of roads and sewers. Current road maintenance expenditures by the City are below the amount required for a optimum maintenance schedule designed to avoid major reconstruction expenses. The Public Works Department has estimated that deferred maintenance of the City's streets has resulted a need for \$60-80 million in repairs and reconstruction.

Utilizing the cost assumptions discussed in the next section, City costs for providing direct services to U.C. Berkeley facilities currently total nearly \$2.7 million, including:

• Police Protection	\$971,000
• Fire Protection	\$1,336,000
• Sanitary Sewer	\$348,000

The above cost estimates include all direct and indirect costs of providing these services.

V. COST/REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS

APPROACH

This section documents the cost and revenue assumptions used in the Fiscal Analysis. The approach used included creating a model of the City of Berkeley's operating budget, identifying costs and revenues that may be affected by the proposed project, construction of algorithms needed to forecast revenues, and conducting interviews with representatives of City departments. Please see the **Technical Appendix** to this report for a representation of the model.

COST ASSUMPTIONS

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

General Government includes the Auditor, City Manager, City Clerk, Finance and Personnel Departments in addition to the Mayor and City Council. Costs were assumed to increase proportionately with other affected costs.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

Fire protection costs were based upon service cost estimates provided by the Fire Department. According to Fire Department records, one-eighth of all non-medical emergency responses, or 279 total responses, were to U.C. Berkeley facilities. Approved projects and the development proposed in the Draft LRDP are expected to result in increased calls.

Fire costs are assumed to increase partially as a result of new building square footage and partially due to increased campus and resident populations. Each of these factors is expected to contribute to increased costs of providing fire protection to U.C. Berkeley buildings based on current per square foot and per person costs.

The Fire Department has suggested a number of mitigation measures for inclusion in the Final LRDP as discussed in the City Staff comments on the Draft LRDP and DEIR. These measures include provision of full automatic sprinklers in all new and rehabilitated structures. If all mitigation measures are implemented, the impacts of the new development will be proportionally less than the existing U.C. Berkeley development on a per square foot measure. Accordingly, fire costs per square foot for new development are assumed to be half that of the existing buildings.

Net costs for emergency medical services provided by the Fire Department are assumed to increase in proportion to the number of new residents, other students, and staff based on a calculation of the net cost per capita and employee for the proposed level of service consisting of three ambulances operating on a 24-hour basis.

POLICE PROTECTION

Police protection costs were based upon cost estimates provided by the City. Increased staffing requirements are based on the Police Department's current ratio of approximately 1.5 officers per 1,000 population and the increase in the City's population due to new residents in approved and proposed dormitories and U.C. Berkeley-related apartments.

Costs for the additional police protection would include the salary of new sworn officers and associated equipment. Including wages, fringe benefits, workers compensation, department overhead costs and other governmental overhead costs, each officer's annual cost is \$106,000, and a sergeant's cost is \$115,000.

OTHER PUBLIC SAFETY

These costs principally include administration and communication of the fire and police departments. They are assumed to increase in proportion to increased fire protection costs. The estimates for police protection and emergency medical services costs already include an appropriate share of these overhead costs.

PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The analysis assured that the City would need to have one planner working half-time performing environmental review of U.C. Berkeley projects, at a cost of \$26,000 per year.

TRAFFIC AND ROADS

The costs of wear and tear on the City's streets resulting from the Draft LRDP are very difficult to quantify. It is obvious that 15 years of nearly constant construction activity by U.C. Berkeley will generate a great deal of truck and heavy equipment traffic on the City's streets. Because truck and heavy equipment traffic is a principal cause of road surface deterioration, it is likely that a significant amount of road maintenance will be associated with buildout of the Draft LRDP. City Staff, in their comments, have requested that U.C. Berkeley perform a specified analysis to determine the magnitude of these costs. Although these costs cannot yet be quantified, City Staff have estimated that \$5-\$10 million would be required simply to reconstruct the sections of Hearst Street, Oxford Street and Bancroft Way surrounding the campus. The total cost of a "Pavement Management Program" in the City, net of deferred maintenance reconstruction, would be in the range of \$3 million annually.

SANITARY SEWER

The costs for provision of sanitary sewer service are based on the rate study recently performed for the City by Brown and Caldwell (see Note 13 of the Fiscal Model in the Technical Appendix). Annual wastewater flow figures are based on the Average Dry Weather Wastewater Flows per gross square footage figures presented in the DEIR, converted to annual hundreds of cubic feet (ccf). The resulting estimates are then multiplied by the appropriate cost per ccf.

The analysis in the DEIR assumed that wastewater would be produced from the Draft LRDP development at the same average rate as the existing structures, while peak campus population remains constant.

OTHER PUBLIC WORKS

Public works costs relating to administration and other overhead costs were assumed to increase directly in proportion to increased direct sanitary sewer costs.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MONITORING

Since State law permits the City to charge public agencies such as U.C. Berkeley for the total costs of providing this service, this cost was not analyzed.

OTHER COSTS

All other costs, including such items as Jail Operations, Parking Services, Recycling, Refuse Collection, Health and Human Services, Rent Stabilization, the Library, were not evaluated because they are covered by revenues, or because potential impacts were considered to be negligible or impossible to quantify reliably with the information included in the Draft LRDP, DEIR or available directly from U.C. Berkeley.

REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS

PROPERTY TAX

U.C. Berkeley is presently exempted from local property taxes. U.C. Berkeley has offered to pay a service charge based on property value and the City's share of total County property taxes (Personal Communication Chancellor Heyman to Mayor Hancock, dated 7/25/88). The concept of such a fee is discussed in more detail under the Mitigation Measures Section of this report. Because no definitive agreement has yet been reached, this potential revenue source was not included in this analysis.

SALES TAX AND BUSINESS TAX

The major source of secondary revenue to the City implementation of the Draft LRDP is retail sales tax. The City receives sales tax revenues equal to 0.95 percent of all taxable sales in the City.

This analysis assumes that dormitory and U.C. Berkeley-operated apartment residents make retail purchases totaling an average of \$2,500/year in Berkeley; other students living in Berkeley and other cities spend an average of \$2,000/year; academic staff, other staff, post-doctoral students, visitors and vendors spend \$7.00 per day, 250 days per year. These estimates are based upon hypothetical budgets and expenditure patterns for students and U.C. Berkeley staff developed by EPS.

If the "opportunity sites" located south of Shattuck Avenue include any of the auto dealers a negative impact upon sales tax could occur. Auto dealers are significant generators of sales taxes. Potential loss of revenues from replacement of South Shattuck auto sales lot with U.C. Berkeley-operated apartments are not quantified in this analysis.

BUSINESS GROSS RECEIPTS TAX

Assumed to increase at the current rate of \$1.20 per \$1,000 of retail sales tax activity.

MOTOR VEHICLE IN-LIEU, CIGARETTE TAX AND STATE GAS TAX

These revenues are distributed by the State based on population. This analysis assumes all new residents in dorms and U.C. Berkeley-operated apartments are included in Berkeley's population for purposes of distributing these revenues.

SANITARY SEWER FEES

U.C. Berkeley currently pays \$100,000 annually to the City for sewer service, based upon a prior agreement. Although this revenue source is scheduled to increase annually, the increase is based on inflation and is not related to the LRDP. Accordingly, this revenue is not evaluated.

ALL OTHER REVENUE SOURCES

Assumed to be unaffected by the Draft LRDP, or assumed to compensate for costs such as Refuse Collection costs which are likewise not evaluated. Other revenues which are not evaluated include the Utility Users Tax, Building Permit Fees, Library Tax, Parking Meter and Parking Fine Revenues, and Landscape and Streetlight Assessment District Fees.

VI. POTENTIAL FISCAL IMPACTS

Fiscal impacts occur when a project generates public service costs that exceed public revenues than can be attributed to the project. Since local governments must balance their budget annually, a project that does not "pay its way" causes:

- 1) A reduction in existing service levels (e.g. existing police patrol serving a larger population would cause a reduction in service to existing residents), or,
- 2) The need to increase taxes or charges paid by existing and future residents and businesses (necessary to maintain service levels).

The significance and magnitude of these impacts is a function of the deficit projected for the project being considered.

The LRDP As Proposed and the three Alternatives analyzed in this report are all shown to generate costs to the City of Berkeley that exceed direct and indirect revenues to the City. Table 2 presents a summary of the analyzed major budget line item costs and revenues, in 1989 dollars, projected for the Alternatives in the year 2005. Appendix B includes year-by-year summaries for each Alternative.

LRDP AS PROPOSED

The LRDP As Proposed would produce the greatest negative fiscal impacts upon the City of any of the Alternatives considered. This is primarily due to the increased costs of serving new on and off campus buildings and a population increase in the City associated with the additional housing.

The annual fiscal deficit to the City at completion of the LRDP As Proposed, in the year 2005, would equal \$1,097,700 in 1989 dollars. Total deficits over the 16 year period between 1989 and 2005 would be greater than \$9.9 million in 1989 dollars.

NO HOUSING ALTERNATIVE

The No Housing Alternative would produce the least negative fiscal impacts upon the City based on the costs and revenues included in this fiscal analysis. Most of the costs evaluated in the fiscal analysis are "people related". Less new resident population equates with lower public service costs. This does not necessarily mean, however, that overall impacts of this Alternative would be the lowest. Rather it reflects that such impacts as those on the housing market could not be included in this analysis. In practice, the costs of coping with pressures on the housing market may require substantial City expenditures.

Table 2
Revenue and Expenditure Impacts
At Buildout of LRDP (2005)

	<u>Draft LRDP Alternatives</u>		<u>Housing</u>	<u>Full</u>
	<u>As Proposed</u>	<u>No Housing</u>	<u>Only</u>	<u>Occupancy</u>
(all figures in 1989 dollars)				
<u>Direct Revenues</u>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Indirect Revenues</u>				
Sales and Use Tax	\$24,500	\$2,400	\$27,100	\$168,700
Business Taxes	3,100	300	3,400	21,300
Fines and Penalties	55,000	10,600	54,900	140,100
Motor Vehicle In-Lieu	157,800	30,800	157,800	157,800
Cigarette Tax	11,000	2,100	11,000	11,000
State Gas Tax	40,000	7,800	40,000	40,000
TOTAL	\$291,300	\$54,000	\$294,200	\$538,800
<u>Expenditures (1)</u>				
General Government (2)	\$40,100	\$19,800	\$31,200	\$49,400
Emergency Medical Services	8,900	1,700	8,900	22,700
Fire Protection	135,700	61,300	109,900	222,700
Police	910,200	114,900	910,200	910,200
Other Public Safety (3)	18,800	8,200	15,400	31,900
Planning and Community Devel.	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
Traffic and Roads	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *
Sanitary Sewer	245,900	115,400	180,600	245,900
Other Public Works (4)	3,300	1,600	2,500	3,300
TOTAL	\$1,389,000	\$348,900	\$1,284,700	\$1,512,200
Operating Surplus (Deficit)	(\$1,097,700)	(\$294,900)	(\$990,500)	(\$973,300)

* These costs are expected to be significant. However, they were not estimated since the necessary data is not readily available.

- (1) Does not include non-quantifiable potential costs, such as those which may be incurred by the City to alleviate housing and child care availability problems caused any of the four Alternatives.
- (2) Includes Auditor, City Manager, City Clerk, Finance and Personnel Departments in addition to the Mayor and City Council.
- (3) Includes indirect Public Safety Department costs based on direct Fire Protection costs.
- (4) Includes indirect Public Works Department costs based on direct Sanitary Sewer costs.

Source: Economic and Planning Systems, Inc.

In addition, as discussed in the City Staff comments on the Draft LRDP and DEIR, many other environmental impact categories, such as air quality and noise, may be much worse under this Alternative than under the other three.

The annual fiscal deficit to the City at completion of the No Housing Alternative, in the year 2005, would equal \$294,900 in 1989 dollars. Total deficits over the 16 year period between 1989 and 2005 would be more than \$3.7 million in 1989 dollars.

HOUSING ONLY ALTERNATIVE

The Housing Only Alternative would produce nearly the same negative fiscal impacts upon the City as the LRDP As Proposed. This is due entirely to the increased costs of serving new residential buildings and the population increase within the City associated with the additional housing.

However, as discussed in the City Staff comments on the Draft LRDP and DEIR, many other environmental impact categories, such as air quality and noise, may be much better under this Alternative due to the lesser degree of non-residential development.

The annual fiscal deficit to the City at completion of the Housing Only Alternative, in the year 2005, would equal \$990,500 in 1989 dollars. Total deficits over the 16 year period between 1989 and 2005 would approach \$9.5 million in 1989 dollars.

FULL OCCUPANCY ALTERNATIVE

The Full Occupancy Alternative would be somewhat less negative than either the LRDP As Proposed or the Housing Only Alternative. This result is due to the fact that the increased non-resident student and faculty would add secondary revenues (sales taxes) without significantly increasing costs above those projected for the other Alternatives based on the costs analyzed in this fiscal analysis.

However, as discussed in the City Staff comments on the Draft LRDP and DEIR, many other environmental impact categories, such as air quality and noise, may be worse under this Alternative than under the LRDP As Proposed.

The annual fiscal deficit to the City at completion of the Full Occupancy Alternative, in the year 2005, would equal \$973,300 in 1989 dollars. Total deficits over the 16 year period between 1989 and 2005 would be more than \$8.8 million in 1989 dollars.

VII. MITIGATION MEASURES

Under the proposed LRDP or any of the Alternatives it is concluded that a significant fiscal impact could occur. Accordingly the following mitigation measures are recommended to be included in the FEIR. The mitigation measures build upon existing and previously recommended programs and reflect a number of different ways U.C. Berkeley can mitigate potential fiscal deficits or reductions in service levels in the City. Each of the following mitigation measures will require subsequent negotiations between the City and U.C. Berkeley.

The mitigation measures address only the fiscal impacts discussed above. Other impacts which may have cost implications, such as those upon child care and housing, are discussed elsewhere in the City's comments on the Draft LRDP and the DEIR.

SEWER CHARGES

U.C. Berkeley should increase its existing sewer charge to the City for sewage transmission from its current amount of approximately \$100,000 to \$346,000, the total amount of direct costs associated with serving U.C. Berkeley. This payment should be increased over time to reflect increases in service costs and the additional flows from proposed future development. At the present time service charges paid by U.C. Berkeley reflect less than thirty percent of the City's actual costs. Increasing the sewer charge would assist the City in meeting its significant reconstruction efforts that it must undertake over the next few years to address the infiltration and inflow problems. Significant environmental problems may result unless deficiencies in the sewerage are corrected.

The proposed budget for City Sanitary Sewer facilities includes total expenditures of \$17.7 million. Of this, nearly \$2.8 million is of Operations and Maintenance of the facilities, and \$15.0 million is for capital projects.

If U.C. Berkeley paid the same rates as other commercial and industrial wastewater producers, they would pay approximately \$1.5 million per year. However, because U.C. Berkeley is a large wastewater discharger which owns and maintains its own collection systems for on-campus facilities, the costs to provide sewer service to these facilities is less than for comparable private facilities. This is why the City estimates the current cost of providing sanitary sewer service to U.C. Berkeley to be \$346,000.

Each of the new facilities discussed in the Draft LRDP will cause an increase in sanitary sewer costs. Additionally, many of the proposed facilities are off-campus, and would cause a more significant impact on sewer facilities. As each new facility is constructed and occupied, U.C. Berkeley should increase their annual sewer charges to cover all increased costs.

PAYMENTS FOR SERVICE

The proposed payment proposed by Chancellor Heyman last year should be modified to reflect an actual service charge, rather than attempting to approximate property taxes.

The Chancellor's proposal included the concept of a payment equal to the property tax based upon "value of the property at construction times 0.0041 which is the actual City percentage of the one percent property tax ..." This formula would be applied to all new off-campus housing.

The problem with the proposed approach is that it bears no relationship to the actual cost of services rendered, nor to the cost increases that will occur over time. In addition, the proposed fee applies only to off-campus housing facilities. To avoid these problems a service charge approach should be adopted. Under this approach, the City would establish, in a clearly documented formula, the cost of providing services to all U.C. Berkeley facilities, both on and off-campus.

A cost factor should be estimated for the following services:

- General Government. This cost should be based upon the actual administrative overhead associated with the other direct services provided. The factor used in the fiscal analysis was 9.3% percent of other analyzed costs.
- Planning. This cost should be based upon the costs involved in environmental review and other aspects of coordinating and regulating Campus and off-Campus development sponsored by U.C. Berkeley. The cost estimate used in the fiscal analysis was \$26,000 annually.
- Police Protection. This cost should be based upon the costs involved with providing police protection to population associated with U.C. Berkeley housing, including existing costs and costs associated with future development. The cost estimate used in the fiscal analysis was based on the assumption that the City would increase police staffing based on current officers per capita standards and the population added in U.C. Berkeley-operated housing. Current annual costs of providing police protection for existing U.C. Berkeley housing is \$971,000.
- Fire Protection. This cost should be based upon the costs involved with providing fire protection to U.C. Berkeley facilities, including existing costs and costs associated with future development. The cost estimates produced in the fiscal analysis was \$1,336,000 annually, including all direct and indirect costs, for existing services, and an increase in annual direct costs of \$135,700 by the year 2005 for the LRDP As Proposed.

- Hazardous Waste Fee. As discussed more fully in the City Staff comments on the DEIR, the City's Division of Environmental Health is responsible for enforcement of State laws affecting U.C. Berkeley concerning the use and storage of hazardous materials. These laws permit the City to charge user fees to cover costs of inspection and monitoring of facilities using, storing and disposing of hazardous materials. U.C. Berkeley should abide by these laws and pay fees sufficient to provide for complete inspection and monitoring of all hazardous materials activities.
- Road Maintenance. This cost should be based upon the costs of providing adequate road maintenance in the City. The charge should reflect the cost of U.C. Berkeley's share (based upon vehicle trips generated) of the City's road maintenance budget, less the amount of indirect revenues received from the State due to increased population in the dormitories.

A service contract would be completed between the City and U.C. Berkeley specifying annual payments in an amount equal to the annual service charge assessment, levied in conformance with the terms of the contract and the mutually agreed formula. This contract would be renegotiated each year in order to take into account increased development or utilization of U.C. Berkeley facilities, in addition to changes in service costs.

CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The willingness of U.C. Berkeley to assist the City by providing needed capital facilities and equipment should be expanded and specified. The City has a number of specific equipment needs directly related to service provided to U.C. Berkeley. U.C. Berkeley could also extend the concept to include certain capital projects such as street reconstruction and/or maintenance activities.

ROAD RECONSTRUCTION

In addition to normal maintenance activities, construction traffic associated with the 15 years of nearly constant construction of facilities proposed in the Draft LRDP will cause a significant increase in road maintenance and reconstruction needs. In order to determine the actual level of these costs, U.C. Berkeley should conduct a study to quantify the impacts upon City streets of increased heavy vehicle traffic caused by implementation of the LRDP. The results of this analysis will be used to determine the appropriate contribution by U.C. Berkeley to road reconstruction costs.

INTERSECTION AND ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Implementation of the LRDP or one of the Alternatives will also cause the need to construct improvements to certain intersections and road sections in the City. For example, the DEIR identified a need for U.C. Berkeley to assist in improvements to the intersection of Ashby and Telegraph Avenues in proportion to U.C. Berkeley's share of incremental peak hour traffic. U.C. Berkeley should cooperate with the City in identifying and funding this and other improvements which would mitigate impacts of the LRDP.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS VEHICLE

The hazardous materials fees discussed above only cover monitoring and inspection of hazardous materials activities, and would not provide sufficient revenues to cover costs of responding to emergencies involving such materials. U.C. Berkeley should also purchase and equip a Hazardous Materials Response Vehicle for use by the City, which would replace a obsolete, former retired fire vehicle currently used for this purpose. The City Staff report explains the need for this vehicle in more detail.

DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

The Draft LRDP includes proposals to develop off-campus sites (Opportunity Sites) in the south of Shattuck area. Depending upon the sites chosen a series of additional impacts could occur (e.g. displacing an auto dealership would decrease City sales and property tax revenues). In order to mitigate potential fiscal impacts, U.C. Berkeley should work with the City in selecting the sites and in planning and constructing the facilities.

ECONOMIC AND PLANNING SYSTEMS

APPENDIX A

LRDP Project List

LRDP Project List

Site #	Project Name	Non-Residential Space		ASF *	Housing		Retail	Category	Area
		ASF *	GSF **		GSF **	beds	ASF *	GSF **	
2.1	College of Chemistry Unit III	62,000	106,000						1
2.2	Latimer Hall Roof Lab add.	5,400	6,600						1
5.1	Genetics/Pt Bio & NW park.	105,600	157,400						1
5.2	LSB Renovation (CC Infill)	15,000	34,600						1
5.4	NW Animal Facility	31,200	55,100						1
5.3	Genetics/Pt Bio Greenhouse	10,500	17,600						2
5.5	University Hall reuse	94,700	156,600						1
8.8	Shattuck-Channing Housing			52,604	100,523	157	9,000	9,700	1
9.1	Foothill Housing			147,343	212,105	760			1
2.3	(Stanley & Campbell annexes)	(2,000)	(2,200)						2
3.1	Business Administration Bldg	122,000	200,000						2
3.1	(Cowell Hosp/2220 Piedmont)	(72,000)	(119,500)						2
3.2	Law Bldg Addition	5,000	8,300						2
3.3	Wurster 4th flr addition	5,000	8,300						2
3.4	Kroeber Hall South addition	6,000	10,000						2
3.5	Morrison-Hertz addition	30,000	50,000						2
3.6	Minor Hall expansion	11,000	18,000						2
3.7	(2241 & 2243 College)	(3,100)	(5,100)						2
4.1	Dwinelle Hall Attic expansion	29,000	48,000						2
4.2	(South Hall annex)	(2,100)	(2,400)						2
6.4	East Asiatic Library	45,000	65,000						2
6.1	Doe/Moffitt underground add.	143,000	181,000						2
6.1	(Doe/Moffitt underground)	(79,000)	(100,000)						2
6.2	Doe Library infill	24,000	30,000						2
6.3	Student Services	36,000	60,000						2
6.3	(T-Buildings)	(50,400)	(71,000)						2
7.1	Alumni House addition	5,800	8,000						2
7.2	ROTC Facility	9,600	16,000						2
7.2	(Temporary ROTC bldg)	(6,900)	(9,200)						2
1.1	Computer Science Building	60,000	100,000						2
1.2	College of Engineering Exp.	20,000	35,000						2
5.7	South Oxford Tract, Step 1	44,000	62,000						2
9.2	Ridge/La Loma Res Hall			10,500	15,000	60			2
5.6	UC Garage Jt Devel site	96,000	160,000						2
5.6	(UC Garage)	(10,600)	(14,100)						2
5.10	UC Printing Plant jt dev site	86,000	143,000						2
5.10	(UC Printing Plant)	(34,700)	(45,100)						2
7.3	Student Health Svc Facility	34,000	56,600				6,000	8,000	2
8.1	Bowditch Res Hall/Parking			70,000	100,000	400			2
8.1	(2401-2405 Bowditch)	(6,200)	(7,400)						2
8.2	Channing/Bowditch Res Hall			48,125	68,750	275			2
8.2	(2334 Bo., 2535,2539,2543 Ch.)	(10,100)	(15,000)						2
8.3	Anna Head Res Hall			70,000	100,000	400			2
8.3	(2536 Channing)	(2,000)	(3,300)						2
8.5	Dwight/Haste Res/Dining/Park.			68,500	97,300	250			2
8.6	Haste/Channing Res/Off/Park.	15,000	23,000	29,400	42,000	200			2
8.9	Clark Kerr Infill			47,040	67,200	250			2
8.9	(Clark Kerr blgs 21,22,23)	(46,300)	(67,200)						2
8.10	I-House addition			26,250	37,500	150			2
8.11	"Opp Sites in Southside ..."			88,200	126,000	600			2
8.12	"S. Shattuck Ave ... Housing"			210,000	300,000	1,200	47,000	62,000	2
9.4	Lawrence Hall of Sci., Step 1	16,400	27,300						2
9.4	Lawrence Hall of Sci., Step 2	7,000	11,700						2
9.8	Environ Health/Safety Fac.	10,000	16,500						2
9.9	Math Sci. Research Inst add	5,400	9,000						2
9.10	Silver Laboratory addition	15,000	25,000						2
9.10	(Silver Lab)	(8,200)	(9,900)						2
1	Central Campus	475,100	752,900						
2	Northside	134,500	214,600	10,500	15,000	60			
3	Westside/Downtown	231,400	400,400						
4	Southside	(15,600)	(13,300)	447,515	638,750	2,525	6,000	8,000	
5	South Shattuck			262,604	400,523	1,357	56,000	71,700	
6	Hill Area	45,600	79,600	147,343	212,105	760			
Total		871,000	1,434,200	867,962	1,266,378	4,702	62,000	79,700	

Total ASF * 1,800,962

Total GSF ** 2,780,278

* ASF = Assignable Square Footage

** GSF = Gross Square Footage

ECONOMIC AND PLANNING SYSTEMS

APPENDIX B

Fiscal Model Budget Summaries for
LRDP as Proposed and Alternatives

Table 10
Budget Summary - New Development
Alternative I--LRDP As Proposed

Fund	TOTAL	Fiscal Year Ending									
		1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	... 2005
(all figures in 1989 dollars)											
Revenues											
Sales and Use Tax	\$208,004	\$1,529	\$3,059	\$4,588	\$6,118	\$7,647	\$9,177	\$10,706	\$12,236	\$13,765	\$24,471
Business Taxes	26,274	193	386	580	773	966	1,159	1,352	1,546	1,739	3,091
Fines and Penalties	467,476	3,437	6,875	10,312	13,749	17,187	20,624	24,061	27,499	30,936	54,997
Motor Vehicle In-Lieu	1,341,174	9,862	19,723	29,585	39,446	49,308	59,169	69,031	78,893	88,754	157,785
Cigarette Tax	93,137	685	1,370	2,054	2,739	3,424	4,109	4,794	5,479	6,163	10,957
State Gas Tax	418,935	4,684	8,662	12,493	16,016	19,251	22,212	24,918	27,382	29,620	40,015
TOTAL	\$2,555,001	\$20,391	\$40,074	\$59,612	\$78,842	\$97,782	\$116,450	\$134,862	\$153,033	\$170,977	\$291,317
Expenditures											
General Government	\$358,918	\$4,779	\$7,133	\$9,486	\$11,840	\$14,194	\$16,548	\$18,902	\$21,255	\$23,609	\$40,086
Emergency Medical Svcs	75,584	556	1,112	1,667	2,223	2,779	3,335	3,890	4,446	5,002	8,892
Fire Protection	1,153,795	8,484	16,968	25,451	33,935	42,419	50,903	59,387	67,870	76,354	135,741
Police	8,173,367	0	114,936	114,936	229,873	229,873	450,468	450,468	565,404	565,404	910,214
Other Public Safety	159,807	1,175	2,350	3,525	4,700	5,875	7,050	8,225	9,400	10,575	18,801
Planning & Community Dev	416,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
Traffic and Roads	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *
Sanitary Sewer	2,090,408	15,371	30,741	46,112	61,483	76,853	92,224	107,595	122,965	138,336	245,930
Other Public Works	28,381	209	417	626	835	1,043	1,252	1,461	1,669	1,878	3,339
TOTAL	\$12,456,260	\$56,573	\$199,657	\$227,805	\$370,889	\$399,036	\$647,779	\$675,927	\$819,011	\$847,159	\$1,389,003
OPERATING SURPLUS (DEFICIT)		(\$36,182)	(\$159,582)	(\$168,193)	(\$292,047)	(\$301,254)	(\$531,329)	(\$541,065)	(\$665,979)	(\$676,182)	(\$1,097,685)

* These costs are expected to be significant. However, they were not estimated since the necessary data is not readily available.

Table 10
Budget Summary - New Development
Alternative II--No Housing

Fund	Fiscal Year Ending										
	TOTAL	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	... 2005
(all figures in 1989 dollars)											
Revenues											
Sales and Use Tax	\$50,144	\$1,086	\$2,171	\$3,257	\$4,343	\$4,178	\$4,014	\$3,850	\$3,685	\$3,521	\$2,369
Business Taxes	6,334	137	274	411	549	528	507	486	465	445	299
Fines and Penalties	153,288	2,636	5,271	7,907	10,542	10,548	10,553	10,559	10,564	10,570	10,608
Motor Vehicle In-Lieu	446,191	7,693	15,386	23,079	30,772	30,772	30,772	30,772	30,772	30,772	30,772
Cigarette Tax	30,986	534	1,068	1,603	2,137	2,137	2,137	2,137	2,137	2,137	2,137
State Gas Tax	149,911	3,654	6,757	9,746	12,494	12,014	11,552	11,107	10,680	10,269	7,804
TOTAL	\$836,854	\$15,740	\$30,928	\$46,002	\$60,837	\$60,176	\$59,534	\$58,910	\$58,304	\$57,713	\$53,989
Expenditures											
General Government	\$240,540	\$4,619	\$6,814	\$9,008	\$11,203	\$12,691	\$14,179	\$15,667	\$17,155	\$17,487	\$19,814
Emergency Medical Svcs	24,784	426	852	1,278	1,704	1,705	1,706	1,707	1,708	1,709	1,715
Fire Protection	674,409	7,530	15,059	22,589	30,118	34,172	38,226	42,279	46,333	48,206	61,320
Police	1,724,045	0	114,936	114,936	114,936	114,936	114,936	114,936	114,936	114,936	114,936
Other Public Safety	90,888	1,034	2,068	3,102	4,137	4,664	5,191	5,718	6,245	6,488	8,194
Planning & Community Dev	416,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
Traffic and Roads	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *
Sanitary Sewer	1,379,100	14,765	29,530	44,295	59,060	70,283	81,506	92,729	103,952	105,379	115,366
Other Public Works	18,723	200	401	601	802	954	1,107	1,259	1,411	1,431	1,566
TOTAL	\$4,568,491	\$54,575	\$195,661	\$221,811	\$247,961	\$265,406	\$282,851	\$300,296	\$317,741	\$321,637	\$348,911
OPERATING SURPLUS (DEFICIT)		(\$38,835)	(\$164,733)	(\$175,808)	(\$187,124)	(\$205,229)	(\$223,316)	(\$241,385)	(\$259,437)	(\$263,924)	(\$294,921)

* These costs are expected to be significant. However, they were not estimated since the necessary data is not readily available.

Table 10
Budget Summary - New Development
Alternative III--Housing Only

Fund	TOTAL	Fiscal Year Ending									
		1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	... 2005
(all figures in 1989 dollars)											
Revenues											
Sales and Use Tax	\$230,372	\$1,694	\$3,388	\$5,082	\$6,776	\$8,470	\$10,163	\$11,857	\$13,551	\$15,245	\$27,103
Business Taxes	29,100	214	428	642	856	1,070	1,284	1,498	1,712	1,926	3,423
Fines and Penalties	466,727	3,432	6,864	10,295	13,727	17,159	20,591	24,023	27,455	30,886	54,909
Motor Vehicle In-Lieu	1,341,174	9,862	19,723	29,585	39,446	49,308	59,169	69,031	78,893	88,754	157,785
Cigarette Tax	93,137	685	1,370	2,054	2,739	3,424	4,109	4,794	5,479	6,163	10,957
State Gas Tax	418,935	4,684	8,662	12,493	16,016	19,251	22,212	24,918	27,382	29,620	40,015
TOTAL	\$2,579,445	\$20,570	\$40,434	\$60,151	\$79,561	\$98,681	\$117,529	\$136,120	\$154,471	\$172,595	\$294,193
Expenditures											
General Government	\$325,172	\$4,724	\$7,023	\$9,323	\$11,622	\$13,921	\$16,220	\$18,520	\$20,819	\$23,118	\$31,191
Emergency Medical Svcs	75,463	555	1,110	1,665	2,219	2,774	3,329	3,884	4,439	4,994	8,878
Fire Protection	1,051,149	8,343	16,686	25,029	33,372	41,715	50,058	58,401	66,744	75,087	109,895
Police	8,173,367	0	114,936	114,936	229,873	229,873	450,468	450,468	565,404	565,404	910,214
Other Public Safety	146,448	1,157	2,313	3,470	4,627	5,783	6,940	8,096	9,253	10,410	15,439
Planning & Community Dev	416,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
Traffic and Roads	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *
Sanitary Sewer	1,847,872	14,951	29,901	44,852	59,802	74,753	89,703	104,654	119,604	134,555	180,648
Other Public Works	25,088	203	406	609	812	1,015	1,218	1,421	1,624	1,827	2,453
TOTAL	\$12,060,559	\$55,932	\$198,376	\$225,883	\$368,327	\$395,834	\$643,937	\$671,444	\$813,888	\$841,395	\$1,284,717
OPERATING SURPLUS (DEFICIT)		(\$35,362)	(\$157,942)	(\$165,732)	(\$288,766)	(\$297,153)	(\$526,408)	(\$535,324)	(\$659,417)	(\$668,800)	(\$990,524)

* These costs are expected to be significant. However, they were not estimated since the necessary data is not readily available.

Table 10
Budget Summary - New Development
Alternative IV--Full Occupancy

Fund	TOTAL	Fiscal Year Ending									
		1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	... 2005
(all figures in 1989 dollars)											
Revenues											
Sales and Use Tax	\$1,433,587	\$10,541	\$21,082	\$31,623	\$42,164	\$52,705	\$63,246	\$73,788	\$84,329	\$94,870	\$168,657
Business Taxes	181,085	1,332	2,663	3,995	5,326	6,658	7,989	9,321	10,652	11,984	21,304
Fines and Penalties	1,191,030	8,758	17,515	26,273	35,030	43,788	52,545	61,303	70,061	78,818	140,121
Motor Vehicle In-Lieu	1,341,174	9,862	19,723	29,585	39,446	49,308	59,169	69,031	78,893	88,754	157,785
Cigarette Tax	93,137	685	1,370	2,054	2,739	3,424	4,109	4,794	5,479	6,163	10,957
State Gas Tax	418,935	4,684	8,662	12,493	16,016	19,251	22,212	24,918	27,382	29,620	40,015
TOTAL	\$4,658,949	\$35,861	\$71,015	\$106,023	\$140,723	\$175,133	\$209,272	\$243,154	\$276,794	\$310,209	\$538,840
Expenditures											
General Government	\$438,263	\$5,362	\$8,299	\$11,237	\$14,174	\$17,111	\$20,048	\$22,986	\$25,923	\$28,860	\$49,421
Emergency Medical Svcs	192,571	1,416	2,832	4,248	5,664	7,080	8,496	9,912	11,328	12,744	22,655
Fire Protection	1,893,223	13,921	27,842	41,762	55,683	69,604	83,525	97,445	111,366	125,287	222,732
Police	8,173,367	0	114,936	114,936	229,873	229,873	450,468	450,468	565,404	565,404	910,214
Other Public Safety	271,133	1,994	3,987	5,981	7,974	9,968	11,962	13,955	15,949	17,943	31,898
Planning & Community Dev	416,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
Traffic and Roads	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *	NA *
Sanitary Sewer	2,090,408	15,371	30,741	46,112	61,483	76,853	92,224	107,595	122,965	138,336	245,930
Other Public Works	28,381	209	417	626	835	1,043	1,252	1,461	1,669	1,878	3,339
TOTAL	\$13,503,345	\$64,272	\$215,055	\$250,902	\$401,685	\$437,532	\$693,974	\$729,821	\$880,605	\$916,452	\$1,512,189
OPERATING SURPLUS (DEFICIT)		(\$28,411)	(\$144,040)	(\$144,879)	(\$260,963)	(\$262,399)	(\$484,703)	(\$486,668)	(\$603,810)	(\$606,243)	(\$973,349)

* These costs are expected to be significant. However, they were not estimated since the necessary data is not readily available.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C124899080

